



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 09/698,181 | 10/30/2000 | James M. Zombek | 003636.0086 | 3564 |

7590 08/21/2003
Ashok K. Mannava
281 Murtha Street
Alexandria, VA 22304

EXAMINER

NAJJAR, SALEH

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|----------|--------------|
|----------|--------------|

2157

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2003

13

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n N .

09/698,181

Examiner

Saleh Najjar

Applicant(s)

ZOMBEK ET AL.

Art Unit

2157

-- The MAILING DATE of this communicati n appears n th cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 June 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 20-26 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-19 and 27-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Pri rity under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 8.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

1. This action is responsive to the communication filed June 13, 2003. In response to the restriction requirement dated May 13, 2003, The applicant elected with traverse Group I claims 1-19, 27-32. The applicant is requested to cancel claims 18-26 in response to this office action. Claims 1-19, 27-32 are considered in this action. Claims 1-19, 27-32 represent system and method for Re-Directing Requests from Browsers for communication over Non-IP based networks.

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:
Pages and 2 of the specification are missing updated application information.
Appropriate correction is required.

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -
(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) do not apply to the examination of this application as the application being examined was not (1) filed on or after November 29, 2000, or (2) voluntarily published under 35 U.S.C. 122(b). Therefore, this application is examined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1, 4-13, 15-19, and 27-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,305.

Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a WEB application interface system in a mobile based client server system (see abstract).

As to claim 1, Gupta teaches a method of deploying content to client applications, comprising:

accepting inbound messages from a client application running on a client device via a proxy IP/port (see figs. 1-2; col. 4-5, see proxy 34);

packaging the inbound messages into an internal message format with an HTTP redirector (see col. 4-5, Gupta discloses that a messages are redirected through the proxy 34);

forwarding the packaged message to a back-end server; receiving a response from a web server (see col. 5, lines 30-45, Gupta discloses that a request is forwarded by the server 22 to the web server 44);

packaging the response into the internal message format with the back-end server and forwarding the response to the HTTP redirector (see figs. 2-3; col. 4, Gupta discloses that WEB agent 42 packs the response back to the internal message format which is forwarded by the message handler 42 to the client system); and

transferring the response to the client application running on the client device via the proxy IP/port (see figs. 1-3; col. 5-6).

As to claim 4, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1 wherein the HTTP redirector acts as a client side proxy (see fig. 2, proxy 34).

As to claim 5, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector provides compression of the inbound packaged message (see figs. 1-3; col. 4, lines 15-20).

As to claim 6, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector provides decompression of the response (see col. 4)

As to claim 7, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1, wherein the HTTP redirector unpacks the packaged response (see col. 4).

Claims 8-13, 15-19, and 27-32 do not teach or define any new limitations above claims 1, 4-7 and therefore are rejected for similar reasons.

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.

Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 2-3, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gupta et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,374,305 in view of Aravamudhan et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,563,919 (referred to hereafter as Ara).

Gupta teaches the invention as claimed including a WEB application interface system in a mobile based client server system (see abstract).

As to claims 2-3, Gupta teaches the method according to claim 1.

Gupta fails to teach the limitation wherein the HTTP redirector sits on top of a library of mobile service and accesses it to obtain information about a wireless protocols supported by the client device.

However, Ara teaches a gateway cluster having a number of gateways for different types of communication protocols by converting network messages to normalized messages by querying the mobile systems where the messages were generated (see abstract). Ara teaches HTTP redirector sits on top of a library of mobile service (see col. 6, Ara discloses that a unified mobility manager UMM 30 provide a unified hardware for processing and providing responses for various types of mobile communications protocols by providing a unified directory services).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Gupta by providing a unified directory of services at the agent 42 to provide for multiple protocol translations. One would be motivated to do so to allow for different types of mobile platforms to interact with the system.

Claims 14 does not teach or define any new limitations above claim 2 and therefore is rejected for similar reasons.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Saleh Najjar whose telephone number is (703) 308-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:30 to 3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Ario Etienne*, can be reached on (703) 308-7562. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-9052.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600. The fax number for the After-Final correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7238. The fax number for official correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7239. The fax number for Non-official draft correspondence/amendment is (703) 746-7240.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Saleh Najjar', with a stylized, cursive script.

Saleh Najjar

Primary Examiner / Art Unit 2157